

would not have supported the popular election of senators had they had the privilege of voting directly on the proposition, but Republican leadership is more conservative than the Republican masses.

The Democrats also led the fight for the Income Tax amendment. It was an income tax law enacted by a Democratic congress in 1894 that was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court by a majority of one, and that judge changed his mind between two hearings of the case. The nullifying of the income tax law of 1894 was the beginning of the fight for an amendment—that seeming to be the only means of securing a tax on income. For years the Democratic fight for an income tax seemed to be hopeless. They made it an issue in 1896 and 1900 but because of the conservative element in the 1904 convention, it was omitted from the platform of that year. During his second term, President Roosevelt unexpectedly—and much to the disgust of the conservatives—declared in favor of an income tax as a means of reducing swollen fortunes. (The Democrats had been advocating the income tax as a fiscal measure for the purpose of securing a more equitable distribution of the burdens of government). Mr. Roosevelt did not inaugurate a crusade for the income tax, and few Republicans of prominence spoke favorably of it. When Mr. Taft announced his candidacy for the presidential nomination, he referred to the income tax in a guarded way, saying that he was in favor of such a tax when it was needed.

In the campaign of 1908 the Democrats again declared in favor of an income tax amendment to the constitution. Mr. Taft's platform was silent on the subject, and he, in his speeches, opposed the amendment, taking the position that an income tax could be secured by statute whenever such a tax was needed. After his election, the progressive Republicans of the Senate joined with the Democrats in support of an income tax as a part of the Aldrich bill. This was opposed by the conservative Republicans; when it became evident that the Democrats and progressive Republicans could together furnish enough votes to attach an income tax provision to the Aldrich bill, the conservative Republicans joined in the submission of the income tax amendment, (the very thing which President Taft had opposed during the campaign) in order to defeat statutory income tax, (the thing that he suggested). As proof that the conservative Republicans did not act in good faith, when they offered to support the income tax amendment in order to defeat a statutory income tax, I cite the fact that they did not urge its ratification. Much to their surprise, the people responded quickly and the income tax amendment was soon a part of the constitution.

In all legislation against the trusts, the Democrats have taken the lead and they have had almost all the leaders of the Republican party against them. Four Democratic National platforms have declared a private monopoly to be indefensible and intolerable. And so, in the passage of the Currency Law—the greatest economic measure placed to the credit of the Wilson administration; the Democrats had the opposition of nearly all the Republican leaders.

I have not included Tariff legislation in the list because the issue which it raises is not as distinctly an issue between the progressive and the conservative as the issue raised by the measures mentioned. A great many Republican progressives favor a high tariff, and a great many conservative Democrats favor a low tariff. If the effects of a protected tariff (the sum added to the price of imported merchandise and the much larger sum added to the price of competing articles manufactured in this country) could be clearly seen, the groups on the two sides of the issue would be more nearly identical with the groups on opposites of the other issue, but the weight of the burden is concealed in the price of the article so that a multitude are deluded. Then, too, the big importers are against the tariff regardless of their conservatism on other subjects, and most of the Democratic manufacturers are for the tariff regardless of their progressiveness on other subjects.

The railroad question furnishes another test in the discussion of progress versus conservatism. The railroads are on the conservative side because they are managed by men who are connected with the Wall Street magnates. In all matters of rates and regulation, the Republican leaders are largely under the influence of the railroad heads, while the Democrats—not all of them but nearly all—are more in sympathy with the people's side.

The Esch-Cummins law may be offered as

proof of the dominating influence of the railroads over Republican leaders.

The progressives in both parties favor BOTH NATIONAL AND STATE regulation of railroads. They believe that national regulation should be ADDED to state regulation, not substituted for it, the conservatives in both parties believe that national regulation should be SUBSTITUTED for STATE REGULATION. In the Republican party, the conservatives were strong enough to secure a plank in 1916, declaring in favor of the surrender of all the power of the states over the railroads in order that the Federal government might have exclusive power to regulate. The railroads have never been able to secure any such declaration in a National Democratic platform. Possibly the Democratic tendency to guard the rights of the state may account for the fact that no serious attempt has been made to commit the Democratic party to the exclusive regulation of railroads by the Federal government. This is not, however, the only reason; the Democratic party stands for complete regulation, and regulation by both state and local governments. The chief reason is that more of the Democrats are free to support a progressive policy.

The primaries held this year indicate a growth in progressive sentiment—more apparent in the Republican party than in the Democratic party because of the triumph of a number of progressive Republicans. Ex-Senator Beveridge's victory over Senator New was the first progressive triumph, although some of Senator Beveridge's utterances indicate that this progressiveness had been overestimated. On some points he is not only conservative but reactionary; in the matter of regulation corporations, he seems to favor the repeal of some of the laws already in force rather than the encouragement of new restrictions.

The nomination of Mr. Pinchot for Governor of Pennsylvania was a distinct shock to the progressives but not so much so as the nomination of Mr. Brookhart in Iowa, and the defeat of Senator McCumber in North Dakota. The re-nomination of Senator Johnson in California is proof that conservatism has not yet regained the strength to resist the Republican progressives in the state; but the sweeping triumph of Senator LaFollette has administered the most stunning blow to conservatism in the Republican party.

In the congressional campaign of 1922, the Democrats, as a whole, are on the progressive side of every important issue and the Republicans, as a party, on the conservative side. Conservative leaders direct the policy of Congress in both the Senate and the House, except where the agricultural bloc has been large enough, acting with the Democrats, to defeat Republican plans.

While the progressive strength is likely to be increased among the Republicans of the Senate, there will not be enough Republicans to accomplish anything except by cooperation with the Democrats, and such progressive Republicans as there may be in the Senate will, in all probability, be coerced by party

(Continued on Page 11)

One dazed Republican editor, agile enough to climb from under the debris of the national election, demands to know where the Republican party is headed for and just when it will arrive where it will land. Judging from the nonchalance with which progressive voters who supported it two years ago left it this year conformed to the vanity of their hopes in that direction, we should be inclined to list this inquiry as among the unimportant things of the future.

Republicans and Republican newspapers that have been consigning LaFollette to the limbo of forgotten and discredited statesmen might find a study of the Wisconsin returns of great educational value. The last we read about it the election figures were complaining that they had so little to do when it came to running up the totals for his opponent. One precinct return read something like this: "LaFollette 240, opponent, none."

The Sioux City Journal, discussing the current criticism of the federal reserve board, says that "it might be profitable to speculate how that much worse the situation would have been had there been no federal reserve system." Western farmers who were forced into bankruptcy by the deflation that was aimed especially at what they had to sell would doubtless like to know just how much worse things could have been.

Democrats Triumph in Fall Elections

Democracy came back into its own in the November elections. With the exception of the loss of senators in two states, the victory was the most complete in years. Almost every state showed a reversal from the unprecedented Republican majorities of 1920, and a return to normal Democratic victories in some states, with sweeping victories in others.

The Republicans still retain control of both houses of Congress, but by greatly reduced majorities. The present Republican majority of twenty-four in the Senate has been cut to ten votes, and the House Republican majority of 157 has been reduced to seventeen votes.

Following is a summary of returns on United States senators and governors by states:

Arizona: Senator—Henry F. Ashurst, D.
Governor—G. W. P. Hunt, D.
California: Senator—Hiram W. Johnson, R.
Governor—F. W. Richardson, R.
Colorado: Governor—Wm. Sweet, D.
Connecticut: Senator—G. P. McLean, R.
Governor—C. A. Templeton, R.
Delaware: Senator—Thomas F. Bayard, D.
Georgia: Senator—Walter F. George, R.
Governor—C. M. Walker, D.
Indiana: Senator—Samuel N. Ralston, D.
Iowa: Senator—S. W. Brookhart, R.
Governor—N. E. Kendall, R.
Kansas: Governor—Jonathan Davis, D.
Maryland: Senator—W. C. Bruce, D.
Massachusetts: Senator—H. C. Lodge, R.
Governor—C. H. Cox, R.
Michigan: Senator—W. N. Ferris, D.
Governor—A. J. Groesbeck, R.
Minnesota: Senator—Dr. Henrik Shipstead, Farmer-labor.
Governor—Fruess, R.
Mississippi: Senator—H. D. Stephens, D.
Missouri: Senator—James A. Reed, D.
Montana: Senator—B. K. Wheeler, D.
Nebraska: Senator—R. B. Howell, R.
Governor—Charles W. Bryan.
Nevada: Senator—Key Pittman, D.
Governor—J. A. Scrugham, D.
New Hampshire: Governor—F. H. Brown, D.
New Jersey: Senator—E. I. Edwards, D.
Governor—G. S. Silzer, D. leading.
New Mexico: Senator—A. A. Jones, D.
New York: Senator—R. S. Copeland, D.
Governor—A. E. Smith, D.
North Dakota: Senator—Lynn Frazier, R.
Governor—R. A. Nestos, R.
Ohio: Senator—S. D. Fess, R.
Governor—A. V. Donahey, D.
Oregon: Governor—Walter M. Pierce, D.
Pennsylvania: Senators—D. A. Reed, R. and G. W. Pepper, R.
Governor—Gifford Pinchot, R.
Rhode Island: Senator—P. G. Gerry, D.
Governor—W. S. Flynn, D. leading.
South Dakota: Governor—W. H. McMaster, R.
Tennessee: Senator—K. D. McKellar, D.
Texas: Senator—E. B. Mayfield, D.
Governor—P. M. Neff, D.
Utah: Senator—W. H. King, D.
Vermont: Senator—F. L. Greene, R.
Virginia: Senator—Claude A. Swanson, D.
Washington: Senator—C. C. Dill, D.
Wisconsin: Senator—R. M. LaFollette, R.
Governor—J. J. Blaine, R.
Wyoming: Senator—John B. Kendrick, D.
Governor—W. B. Ross, D.

NEBRASKA DEFEATS CHANGE IN PRIMARY LAW

Every Republican legislature in Nebraska in the last ten years has changed the primary law, each change representing the desire of the professional politicians to edge back to the nominating convention, where their peculiar talents can find profitable play. Each time the people, by a referendum, have knocked out the law. The latest attempt was at the last session. It was the baldest effort of all and included an effort to give the convent on the power of endorsing a set of candidates with the object of giving this group the advantage at the following election. At this writing the returns on the referendum taken on this law were not all in, but those counted indicated about a four to one vote against the law. With Mr. Bryan in the governor's chair there will be no such bill enacted into law, even if the vote on the last attempt isn't emphatic enough to deter the Republican politicians from further mining and sapping. The people prefer to make their own nominations, and will not delegate the power to any group of self-selected men.